DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 925 UD 016 823

AUTHOR Brown, Eric R.
TITLE School-Community Interaction Umbrella: English as a Second Language (PS152) & Early Identification Program (PS139); February 13, 1975- June 26, 1975. Final Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 26 Jun 75
NOTE 17p.
AVAILABLE FROM New York City Board of Education Function Number 20-53438

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Early Reading; *Elementary Education; *English (Second Language); Grade 1; Grade 2; *Non English Speaking; Puerto Ricans; Reading Ability; Reading Achievement; Reading Diagnosis; Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Reading Skills; *School Community Cooperation
IDENTIFIERS *New York (Manhattan)

ABSTRACT

This report provides a description and evaluation of two school programs in New York City. The programs are English as a Second language at P.S. 152, and the Early Identification Program at P.S. 139. Both were planned with the participation of the principal, the parents, and the school district staff. The first program was designed to supplement regular instruction in English and reading for children who could not speak English fluently. An ESL teacher provided instruction to these children. The teacher used the audio-lingual method 45 minutes a day in small group sessions with the students. The program at P.S. 139 was designed to prevent reading retardation by early identification of reading problems in children from grades one and two. Students in this program were selected on the basis of their reading readiness scores in grade one, or their primer or grade one reading scores in grade two. Two paraprofessionals worked with forty first and second grade students under the supervision of a regular reading teacher. A diagnosis of the reading skills needed by each student was made by the coordinating teacher. She then prescribed individual programs to be carried out by the paraprofessionals. This program supplemented regular classroom instruction in reading. Twenty seven first and second graders participated in the program. Findings indicate that all the students enrolled in the program at P.S. 152 did not show substantial gain in their ability to communicate in English as measured by the Language Assessment Battery. First grade children at P.S. 139 made substantial gains when treated on an individual basis. (Author/AM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED135925

EVALUATION REPORT FOR B/E FUNCTION NUMBER 20-53438

FINAL REPORT

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY INTERACTION UMBRELLA: ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (PS 152) & EARLY IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM (PS 139)

February 13, 1975 -- June 26, 1975

Dr. Eric R. Brown

An evaluation of selected New York City Umbrella Program funded under a Special Grant of the New York State Legislature performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1974-1975 school year.

UD016823

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

Chapter I

THE PROGRAM

This project involved two programs in District 22: an English as a Second Language Program at P.S.152, and an Early Identification Program at P.S. 139. For the purposes of presentation and discussion, these programs will be dicussed separately within each subsection of this report.

A survey of P.S. 152 indicated that there were at least 254 Puerto Rican pupils and 68 pupils in other minority groups. Of these, approximately 30 students scored in the lowest range of the rating scale of Pupil's Ability to Speak English. It was decided, therefore, that there was a clear need for an English as a Second Language program for those students. Pupils who participated in this program were selected on the basis of their performance on the above test; the criterion performance was a score of 15 or below.

The program for P.S. 152 was cooperatively planned with the principal, parents from the school, and the District staff. District 22 wished to develop in non-English speaking students a facility in the use of the English language in order to learn reading and math skills. An ESL teacher was hired who would use th audio-lingual approach to this problem. The instructor would work with approximately thirty students from grades 1-6 in small group instruction for 45 minutes each day. It was expected that as a result of this instruction, 100% of the students being serviced would advance by one level on an English language fluency scale within the course of the semester. The emphasis in the program

was to be on listening and speaking skills with a gradual shift to reading and writing. Dialogues were to be used to develop vocabulary, with accompanying pattern practice drill. This program was to supplement regular instruction in English and reading that already existed in the home classroom.

Funds were used to hire an ESL teacher as planned. While this teacher had minimal ESL experience prior to the present assignment, her extensive experience as a K-1 teacher with remedial reading training more than compensated for this deficiency. In actuality, because of necessary planning for the program, instruction did not begin until approximately March 1 and continued until the end of the school year, June 26, 1975. A total of forty-two students were serviced by the program, ranging from first through sixth grades. The numerical distribution was: ten students in Grade 1, six students in Grade 2, eight students in Grade 3, three students in Grade 4, eight students in grade 5, and seven students in Grade 6.

Students were seen for 45 minutes each day in small groups of about six. Instruction followed the audio-lingual method, beginning with the teacher's initial assesment of the child's ability in English, and proceeding through elicited conversation to stories and the beginnings of pre-reading and writing activities. Some children required a one-to-one approach, especially those who were new arrivals to the United States. The emphasis throughout was on conversation dealing with real objects and practical issues of real interest to the child. A variety of ESL and pre-reading materials were used that the teacher was able to assemble. There was an especially impressive collection of picture cards that were used to elicit descriptions from the children.

Each child kept his own folder documenting his own progress.

At P.S. 139 an analysis of the scores of the Metropolitan Achievement Test given in April, 1974, indicated that 68 pupils in grades two and three were reading one or more years below grade level. There was, therefore, a need for early identification of reading problems in grades one and two to prevent this type of reading retardation. Students in this program were selected on the basis of their reading readiness scores in grade one, or their primer or grade one reading scores in grade two.

As was the case at P.S. 152, the program for P.S. 139 was cooperatively planned with the principal, parents from the school, and the District staff. Funds were to be used to hire two paraprofessionals for 5 1/2 hours each school day from February 18 to June 26, 1975. These Educational Assistants would work with a total of forty first and second grade students under the supervision of a regular (tax levy) reading teacher. A diagnosis of the reading skills needed by each student would be made by the coordinating teacher. She would prescribe individual programs that would be carried out by the paraprofessionals. The students would be taken in small groups of two-to-five pupils for a thirty minute period every day. This program would supplement regular classroom instruction in reading.

On the basis of teacher recommendations, 24 children in the first grade were screened on the Metropolitan Readiness Test early in March. Only those children who received D or E ratings on the test were included in the program (ten children). In the second grade, 39 children were screened on recommendation with the Gates-MacGinitie

Primary A. Of those screened, 27 children were accepted in the program. Each child received 45 minutes of special assistance each day, the first grade children on a one-to-one basis, the second grade children in groups of two to three. The paraprofessionals worked essentially with manipulative self-directed materials. Particular success was noted with visual perception training and auditory discrimination, plus elementary phonics with the older children. A conference was held with each teacher initially about the child. Guidance files were also checked, and parents came to see both the regular classroom teacher and the reading teacher. There was positive feedback from parents and teachers as to the difference the program was making.

Chapter II

EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

Evaluation Objective #1: To improve the growth of 100% of the students being serviced by one level as measured by the Language Assessment Battery - English.

Subjects: All participants in the program at P.S. 152.

Methods and Procedures: The appropriate forms of the city-wide administered Language Assessment Battery - English to be administered on a pre-post basis 2/75 and 6/75 respectively. This battery to be used to assess pupil's progress in developing English language competence.

The instructor at P.S. 152 and the project coordinator confirmed that the language assessment test had first been given in October, 1974, rather than the 2/75 date. The post test was completed as scheduled in

early June using the Language Assessment Battery - English. This test was normed on a monolingual English population, and court ordered cut-off scores established at the 20th percentile were considered evidence of the child being "effective" in English. Thirty-two children were tested of the forty-two in the program. This discrepancy is largely due to absenteeism and the relative mobility of this population. The evaluation objective has been modified to determine the percentage of children who reached criterion performance of the 20th percentile for their grade level group, rather than number and pecentage of students who gain one level on the test as originally proposed.

Evaluation Objective #2: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the program, the reading or pre-reading level of the students will show a statistically significant increase between pre-test and post-test scores.

Subjects: All participants in the program at P.S. 139.

Methods and Procedures: The appropriate forms of either the Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test or the Gates-MacGinitie Primary Reading Test will be administered on a pre-post basis 3/75 and 6/75 respectively. These test batteries to be used to assess any significant progress in reading.

Analysis of Data: Data to be analyzed with a correlated t test design.

Pre and post tests were carried out as planned on appproximately 3/1/75 and 6/15/75 respectively. A total of 37 students were tested. For the ten first graders, it was necessary to adopt a letter rating

system which is a part of this test. Children were initially selected who received ratings of D or E on the Metropolitan Readines Test, Form A. For them, progress was designated as a progression of one or more letter grade levels in readiness activities on the Form B post-test. Second grade children completed Forms A and B of the Gates MacGinitie as scheduled.

Evaluation Objective #3: To evaluate the extent to which the program as actually carried out coincided with the program as described in the project proposal.

Subjects: All participants in the program.

Methods and Procedures: In order to evaluate the quality and extent to which the program has been implemented, close monitering of the respective programs will be carried out by conducting a site visit at the end of the project period; by examining rosters of students and personnel participating in the project, along with other documents related to the implementation of the program; and by maintaining contact with the project coordinator in order to obtain data on all aspects of the functioning of the project.

Analysis of Data: A statement concerning the extent of impementation of the program will be made, and, where serious discrepancies exist between proposal and program, will provide a description of those discrepancies.

Chapter III

FINDINGS

Evaluation Objective #1: To improve the growth of 100% of the students being serviced by one level as measured by the Language Assessment Battery - English.

As was cited above, only 32 of the 42 participants in the program at P.S. 152 took the post-test measure. Of these 32 students, only eight (8) pupils, or 25% of the group, successfully reach the critrion level of performance for their grade level. Therefore, this objective was not achieved. Since the total instructional period was only a little over three months, with a highly transient population substantial gains in English language competence would have been most unlikely.

Evaluation Objective #2: To determine whether, as a result of participation in the program, the reading or pre-reading level of the students will show a statistically significant increase between pre-test and post-test scores.

Of the ten first grade students, nine of the ten increased by one or more letter ratings on the Metropolitan Readiness Test. For example, four of the children achieved a B rating, which is high-normal on the test norm scales. Therefore, for this group the revised objective was fulfilled. However, for the first grade group there was no significant difference between pre-test and post-test scores (see Table 1).

Table 1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR PRE AND POST

VOCABULARY AND COMPREHENSION TESTS, N=27

Item	Vocabulary		Comprehension	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Mean	1.62	1.62	1.64	1.58
S.D.	.18	.22	.29	.28

This lack of significant change may be due to the short time span of actual instruction (three months). More likely it merely reflects that few if any standardized tests would be sensitive to a three month difference in reading ability. Finally, both paraprofessionals commented that the first grade children tended to respond more, perhaps because of the one-to-one relationship.

Evaluation Objective #3: To evaluate the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the project proposal.

No major discrepancies were noted between the program as described and what was observed by the evaluator. Facilities were adequate for instruction purposes; materials were improvised as available within the two schools. Necessary changes in the evaluation design have been discussed above. Both programs appeared to be servicing the target populations for which they were designed.

Chapter IV

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Evaluation Objective #1 was not achieved in that 100% of the students did not show substantial gain in their ability to communicate in English as measured by the Language Assessment Battery. Evaluation Objective #2 was only partially achieved in that the second grade students, who were the majority of the group served by this program, showed no measurable difference in their reading competence. Evaluation Objective #3 was achieved; the program as described rather closely fitted that observed. Lack of documented academic growth as measured in Objectives One and Two may be attributed to the short time span of the program and the inability of the measuring instruments to detect any such changes.

These findings should not, however, be taken as an indication of lack of success of the two programs. First grade children at P.S. 139 did make substantial gains when treated on a one-to-one basis. Two problems effectively masked any possible growth patterns: (1) the short duration of the programs per se; and (2) the inability of standardized test instruments to show change within a three month time span. Indeed, interviews and discussions held by the evaluator with personnel in the program would indicate that the programs made substantial changes in the learning atitudes of the children.

It is therefore the recommendation of the present evaluator that the programs at P.S. 152 and P.S.139 be continued for the next academic year. This recommendation is made on the basis of insufficient evidence from this year's programs as to the true effectiveness of

these activities. A longer instructional period is needed to make a true determination. It is the additional suggestion of the evaluator that a small materials allocation be included in next year's planning. Materials chosen to specifically support the activities in these programs would increase their probability of success.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE B/E # 20-53438

Measures of growth other than Standardized Tests

31. This question is designed to describe the attainment of approved objectives not normally associated with measurement by norm referenced standardized achievement tests. Such objectives usually deal with behavior that is indirectly observed, especially in the affective domain. For example, a reduction in truancy, a positive change in attitude toward learning, a reduction in disruptive behavior, an improved attitude toward self (as indicated by repeated interviews), etc., are frequently held to be prerequisite to the shift toward increased academic achievement by disadvantaged learners. Where your approved measurement devices do not lend themselves to reporting on tables 26, 27, 28, or 29, use any combination of items and report on separate pages. Attach additional pages if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code	
6 1 4 1 4	7 2 0	8 1 6	30

Brief Description Language Assessment Battery -- N.Y.C. Board of Education

Number of cases observed: 1 5 Number of cases in treatment: 1 8

Pretreatment index of behavior (Specify scale used): A score of 15 or below on the rating scale of Pupil's Ability to Speak English.

Criterion of success: Scores at the 20th percentile or better on the Language Assessment Battery.

Was objective fully met? Yes [ ] No [X] If yes, by what criteria do you know?

Comments:

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE B/E # 20-53438

Measures of growth other than Standardized Tests

31. This question is designed to describe the attainment of approved objectives not normally associated with measurement by norm referenced standardized achievement tests. Such objectives usually deal with behavior that is indirectly observed, especially in the affective domain. For example, a reduction in truancy, a positive change in attitude toward learning, a reduction in disruptive behavior, an improved attitude toward self (as indicated by repeated interviews), etc., are frequently held to be prerequisite to the shift toward increased academic achievement by disadvantaged learners. Where your approved measurement devices do not lend themselves to reporting on tables 26, 27, 28, or 29, use any combination of items and report on separate pages. Attach additional pages if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code	
6 1 4 1 3	7 2 0	8 1 6	30

Brief Description Language Assessment Battery -- N.Y.C. Board of Education

Number of cases observed: 1 7 Number of cases in treatment: 2 4

Pretreatment index of behavior (Specify scale used): A score of 15 or below on the rating scale of Pupil's Ability to Speak English.

Criterion of success: Scores at the 20th percentile or better on the Language Assessment Battery.

Was objective fully met? Yes [ ] No [X] If yes, by what criteria do you know?

Comments:

EARLY IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM B/E # 20-53438

Measures of growth other than Standardized Tests

31. This question is designed to describe the attainment of approved objectives not normally associated with measurement by norm referenced standardized achievement tests. Such objectives usually deal with behavior that is indirectly observed, especially in the affective domain. For example, a reduction in truancy, a positive change in attitude toward learning, a reduction in disruptive behavior, an improved attitude toward self (as indicated by repeated interviews), etc., are frequently held to be prerequisite to the shift toward increased academic achievement by disadvantaged learners. Where your approved measurement devices do not lend themselves to reporting on tables 26, 27, 28, or 29, use any combination of items and report on separate pages. Attach additional pages if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code	
6 0 8 1 3	7 2 2	8 0 2	30

Brief Description Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test

Number of cases observed: 1 0 Number of cases in treatment: 1 0

Pretreatment index of behavior (Specify scale used): Pre -- Form A; Post -- Form B.

Criterion of success: Increase of one or more letter ratings.

Was objective fully met? Yes [X] No [ ] If yes, by what criteria do you know? Nine of ten students met criterion.

Comments:

Use Table 28 for norm referenced achievement data not applicable to Table 26. (See "Instructions" Item 5 before completing this table.)

28. Standardized Test Results

In the table below, enter the requested assessment information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project components/activities in achieving desired objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary. [27]

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used 1/	Form		Level		Total N 2/	Group ID 3/	Number Tested		Pretest			Posttest			Statistical Data		Subgroup 9/
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post			4/ N	5/	Date	Mean	6/ SD	Date	Mean	6/ SD	7/ Test	8/ Value	
6 0 8 1 3	7 2 0	Gates '75	A	B	Prim.	"	27	Gr. 2	27	1	3/75	1.64	.29	6/75	1.58	.28	t	-.06	N.S.

1/ Identify test used and year of publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)
2/ Total number of participants in the activity.
3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
4/ Total number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations.
5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = z score; 4 = Standard score (publisher's); 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.
6/ SD = Standard Deviation
7/ Test statistics (e.g., t; F; X^2).
8/ Obtained value
9/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

-4-